APS Milproj Project ("21st Century Educational Needs Project")

<u>Key Focus</u>

Focus on the manner in which information technology reshapes the boundaries in higher education, among
- Institutions
- Disciplines
- Levels of education
- Between higher education and society

Aimed at addressing the broader role of IT in determining higher education's ability to serve the changing educational needs of a knowledge-driven society. It intends to develop alliances to link and inform the leadership across the entire higher education enterprise (national associations, states, disciplines, foundations), to build knowledge resources such as web portals to support these associations; and to develop technology roadmaps for colleges and universities, higher education associations, and stakeholders such as state and federal government.

Although this project aims at stimulating and supporting a dialog among the leadership of various national higher ed associations, much of its activity will be focused on particular case studies of building coalitions among diverse institutions and programs to understand better how information technology will affect the systemic nature of higher education.

<u>Basic Elements</u>

Building Leadership Linkage Groups (Year 1)

>National higher education associations leadership group
>Statewide college and university networks
>>State of Michigan
>>Other states
>Cross-disciplinary group
>>UM specific
>>Other institutions
>Foundation leadership group
>International group
>Other possible linkages
>>Federal agencies

Knowledge Resources (Year 2)

>Web-portal development
>Collaboration space for linkage groups
>Technology workshops at the Media Union
>Research Seminar on IT and Higher Education

Developing Strategies and Policy Recommendations (Year 3)

Roadmaps
> For colleges and universities
> For national associations
> For stakeholders
> For state governments
> For federal governments

Policy Forums
> Colleges
> State governments
> Federal government

Continuing and Mainstreaming Leadership Linkage Groups

Products

The establishment of several key leadership groups that link together key constituencies in higher education to consider the impact of digital technology.

The development of knowledge resources such as written documents, web portals, and an intellectual framework (developed by the proposed research seminar) to help guide strategic planning and decisions.

Strategic technology roadmaps to guide institutions, associations, and stakeholders in the development of strategies, policies, programs, and investments to shape the evolution of higher education during a period of technology driven change.

Evolutionary Plan

Work from pilot project level in Year 1 to more extensive implementation in Years 2 and 3.

Pilot Phase:

> National Associations
>
>> David Ward (ACE)
>> Nils Hasselmo (AAU)
>> Peter McGrath (NASULGC)
>
> State Level: Michigan
>
>> University of Michigan
>> Eastern Michigan University
>> UM-Dearborn

> Oberlin College
> Kalamazoo College
> Washtenaw Community College
> Oakland Community College
> Michigan Virtual University

> (Intent is to expand in second year to include all of Michigan's public universities (PCSUM) and a group of liberal arts colleges (Great Lakes College Association) and an expanded set of nontraditional or commercial educational providers (Michigan Virtual University, University of Phoenix, etc.)

Eventually explore propagating what we have learned to other states (Ohio, North Carolina, Georgia, Texas, and Washington).

The project also involves developing a series of technology strategy roadmaps for various classes of institutions, again responding to the great diversity in size, mission, and character of higher education in America. The Michigan effort will work directly with a set of specific colleges and universities to assist them in developing both strategic technology plans and supporting alliances and networks, and from this direct involvement, develop models capable of propagating to the broader higher education community.

Comparison with ITFRU

> Subjects: research universities vs. broader higher education enterprise

> Methods: national guidance groups and conferences vs. campus-based or regional alliances and networks

> Objectives: concern about national research enterprise vs. the broader educational needs of a knowledge-driven society

> Disciplinary

> > UM LS&A Faculty
> > Professional schools (COE, SOI, SBA, SEd, Med)

> Knowledge Resources

> > Web resources and research seminar to support startup alliances
> > Design of technology workshops at Media Union
> > Early dissemination

Evaluation, Benchmarking, and Progress Measures

General Evolution:
> Year 1: Self evaluation
> Year 2: Independent, external review
> Year 3: Institutional adoption

Design

    Structured self-evaluation process

    External evaluation

        Independent review group

            Bill Massey, Frank Newman, Marvin Peterson,
            Bob Zemsky, Patti Gumport, Pat Callen

        Subject materials to peer review?

        Benchmarking against other organizations such as
            Educause, NCPI, etc.

    How to measure adoption by institutions, governments, and other
        Stakeholders ("customer acceptance").

        We need to begin compiling documentation of the status of
        college, university, and state higher education system planning
        regarding digital technology to establish a baseline for measuring
        subsequent impact of the project.

ITFRU Project

Objective 1: To form and sustain for a three-year period an ongoing guidance group consisting of leaders from higher education, industry, and government to monitor and assess the implications of evolving ICT for the research university and to develop a strategic roadmap to assist the higher education community.

Objective 2: To conduct a series of major summit meetings at the NAS intended to stimulate awareness of these issues and help universities develop appropriate strategies for digital technology.

> 2002-2003: University Presidents and Board Chairs
> Foundation Presidents and CIOs
>
> 2003-2004: Academic leaders
> Conference 1: Impact on learning
> Conference 2: Impact on scholarship
> Conference 3: Impact on academic outreach
>
> 2004-2005: Regional meetings for university faculty leadership
> Four regional meetings
> National summit meeting for faculty leadership

Objective 3: To design, develop, and implement web-based resources to support both the guidance committee and the summit meetings, enabling further dialog and distributing the results of these discussions to broader communities.

Rationale

To provide the higher education community with an ongoing process capable of tracking technology changes and their implications, identifying key issues, challenges, and opportunities, stimulating awareness on the campuses, and making recommendations for actions or further studies.

Important to raise the awareness of these issues on the campuses and guide the development of a strategic framework for making decisions. Invite two-dozen universities to participate in a townhall meeting process.

A series of workshops would also be organized to bring together academic leaders from diverse institutional types such as research universities, liberal arts colleges, and regional colleges and universities; deans from various academic and professional disciplines, leaders of faculty governance, and university trustees.

Expected that the project will ultimately catalyze the launch of more focused studies concerning technology issues facing higher education.